served with the Second Amended Complaint on September 17, 2010, and responded with a motion to dismiss the Second Amended Complaint set to be heard November 15, 2010.

Defendants **LODES CAPITAL ESCROW, INC.**, and **NIKKI HALL** are represented by Fred S. Pardes with the Law Offices of Fred S. Pardes, 34211 Pacific Coast Highway, Suite 103, Dana Point, California. Said defendants were served with the Second Amended Complaint on September 17, 2010, and filed their answer on October 8, 2010. Said defendants also joined in JONATHAN ANNETT's motion to dismiss the Second Amended Complaint set to be heard November 15, 2010.

Parties Who Have Been Served and Not Yet Appeared

Defendants OCWEN FINANCIAL CORPORATION and MORTGAGE ELECTRONIC REGISTRATION SYSTEMS, INC., are represented by Brent A. Kramer with the law firm of Houser & Allison, 3760 Kilroy Airport Way, Suite 260, Long Beach, California. Said defendants were served with the Second Amended Complaint on September 17, 2010. No resopnse has been filed to date.

Defendant **WESTERN PROGRESSIVE, LLC**, was served with the Second Amended Complaint on September 23, 2010. No response has been filed to date.

Defendant **HOME LOANS DIRECT** was served with the Second Amended Complaint on September 23, 2010. No response has been filed to date.

Parties Who Have Not Been Served

Plaintiff has been unable to effect service of the Second Amended Complaint on defendant **FOX FIELDS FINANCIAL.** Plaintiff filed a Declaration of Due Diligence regarding this defendant on October 13, 2010.

Plaintiff has been unable to effect service of the Second Amended Complaint on defendant **DENNIS WILLIAM COX**. Plaintiff filed a Declaration of Non-Service regarding

this defendant on October 13, 2010.

Dismissed/Terminated Parties

All remaining defendants have been dismissed, the complaint having been terminated againast them (to wit: AMERICAN HOME LOANS dba CBSK FINANCIAL CORP.; DE HDL, INC.; CHRISTOPHER FOX; and HISHAM DESOUKI).

B. SUMMARY OF CLAIMS

Lillie Mae Washington ("Plaintiff") alleges the following:

This action arises from predatory lending practices that led to a threatened foreclosure of Plaintiff's home. Plaintiff is a 96-year-old woman that has been living in her home for 36 years. Plaintiff was fraudulently induced to refinance her property to an adjustable rate mortgage.

In October 2006, ex-defendant AMERICAN HOME LOANS' agent persuaded Plaintiff's now deceased son, Hobert Washington, to obtain a loan from AMERICAN HOME LOANS. AMERICAN HOME LOANS' agents made fraudulent misrepresentations to the Plaintiff regarding the loan terms. Plaintiff relied on these representations to her detriment. AMERICAN HOME LOANS failed to provide documents to the Plaintiff which are required under the Truth in Lending Act "TILA," and Housing Urban Development Act "HUD."

In September 2009, Plaintiff contacted Defendant OCWEN for a loan modification. Plaintiff did not hear back from Defendant OCWEN even though she sent them a completed application. Around April 2010, Defendant WESTERN PROGRESSIVE sent Notices of Default in an aggressive and harassing manner.

Based on these allegations, Plaintiff filed suit for violation of the Truth in Lending Act, 15 United States Code Section 1601, *et seq.*; violation of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act, 12 United States Code Section 2601, *et seq.*; rescission of contract; predatory lending practices; unjust enrichment; violation of California Business and Professions Code Section

17200, et seq. ("UCL"); violation of California Civil Code §§ 1709, 1571 et. seq.; negligent misrepresentations; violation of Consumer Legal Remedies Act, California Civil Code §§ 1770(5)(9)(16)(19); breach of fiduciary duties; and financial abuse of elders under California Welfare & Institutions Code § 15610.30.

Defendants LODES CAPITAL ESCROW and NIKKI HALL deny any allegations of wrongdoing.

C. SERVICE OF PROCESS

Defendant **WESTERN PROGRESSIVE, LLC**, was served with the Second Amended Complaint on September 23, 2010. No response has been filed to date.

Defendant **HOME LOANS DIRECT** was served with the Second Amended Complaint on September 23, 2010. No response has been filed to date.

Plaintiff has been unable to effect service of the Second Amended Complaint on defendant **FOX FIELDS FINANCIAL.** Plaintiff filed a Declaration of Due Diligence regarding this defendant on October 13, 2010.

Plaintiff has been unable to effect service of the Second Amended Complaint on defendant **DENNIS WILLIAM COX**. Plaintiff filed a Declaration of Non-Service regarding this defendant on October 13, 2010.

D. JOINDER OF ADDITIONAL PARTIES

The parties do not anticipate the joinder of additional parties at this time.

E. AMENDMENT OF PLEADINGS

Plaintiff filed a Second Amended Complaint on September 21, 2010. No further amendments are anticipated.

F. JURISDICTION AND VENUE

Jurisdiction is proper in this Court because plaintiff's Complaint includes claims for

1

7

12

131415

1617

18

19

2021

2223

24

2526

27

28

Violation of the Truth in Lending Act, 15 United States Code Section 1601, *et seq.* and Violation of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act, 12 United States Code Section 2601, *et seq.* All of plaintiff's claims arise from the same controversies and series of events.

Plaintiff contends venue is proper in this Court. Defendants deny that venue is improper as to Defendant LODES which has its sole office in Orange County.

G. ANTICIPATED MOTIONS

The parties anticipate that discovery motions and/or other motions including, but not limited to, motions in limine may be filed, depending upon how the case progresses.

H. ANTICIPATED DISCOVERY

The parties believe that discovery should be deferred pending the pleadings challenges and until such time as the pleadings are set. This approach will ensure that judicial resources and those of the parties are not directed toward claims and issues that will not be part of the case going forward.

I. PROPOSED DISCOVERY PLAN

- (1) All parties agree that the exchange of Initial Disclosures should be deferred until 30 days after the last defendant files an answer or responsive pleading to the then-operative complaint.
 - (2) The parties do not believe that phased discovery is needed.
- (3) The parties do not currently foresee any discovery issues or disputes that require the Court's involvement. Should any such issue arise, the parties agree to work together in good faith to resolve the issue but will promptly submit any such issue to the Court for resolution if required.
- (4) All parties agree that the limitation on discovery set by the federal and local rules should govern unless a party makes a showing that additional discovery is required and obtains

1 an order from the Court approving such discovery. J. SCHEDULING OF FURTHER PROCEEDINGS AND COMPLETION DATES 3 The parties believe that any discovery plan and other issues, including the Federal Rules 4 5 of Civil Procedure 26(f) conference should be continued in this matter until pleadings are closed. 6 K. APPROPRIATENESS OF SPECIAL PROCEDURES 7 No special procedures are contemplated at this time. 8 JURY TRIAL DEMAND L. 9 Jury has been demanded. 10 M. **ESTIMATE OF TRIAL TIME** 11 The parties estimate a 4-5 day jury trial. 12 13 N. PROPOSED MODIFICATION TO STANDARD PRETRIAL PROCEEDINGS 14 The parties do not currently anticipate any need to modify the standard pretrial 15 procedures. 16 17 0. RELATED CASES 18 No related matters. 19 P. **SETTLEMENT** 20 The parties are willing to participate in mediation, but believe that mediation will only be 21 effective if it takes place after the pleadings are settled and discovery is underway. The parties 22 do not consent to the trial judge or magistrate judge acting as settlement judge at this time. 23 24 Q. VOLUNTARY DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROGRAM. 25 The parties are willing to participate in mediation, but believe that mediation will only be 26 effective if it takes place after the pleadings are settled and discovery is underway. 27 28

R. OTHER MATTERS THAT MAY BE CONDUCIVE TO THE JUST AND 1 EXPEDITIOUS DISPOSITION OF THE MATTER 2 The parties are not aware of any other matters that should be discussed at this time, 3 4 ABDALLAH LAW GROUP DATED: November 8, 2010 5 6 7 Attorneys for Plaintiff LILLY MAE WASHINGTON 8 9 FRED S. PARDES LAW OFFICES 10 11 Attorneys for Defendants NIKKI HALL and 12 LODES CAPITAL ESCROW, INC. M See email attached 13 14 DATED: November OLSON LAW FIRM 15 16 SHAWN M. OLSON 17 Attomeys for Defendant JONATHAN ANNETT 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 JOINT STATUS REPORT FOR SCHEDULING CONFERENCE

Nov 08 2010 10:23AM FRED PARDES ATTORNEY AT L 949 443 3601 Case 2:09-cv-08213-DMG -RZ Document 77 Filed 11/09/10 Page 7 of 9 Page ID #:626 Nov. 8. 2010 8:47AM eskaton fair oaks No. 7513 P. 8 From: Shawn Olson [mailto:shawnmolson@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, November 09, 2010 4:23 PM

To: tricia@abdallahlaw.net

Subject: Re: FW: Washington v. Home Loans Direct

Ms. Lenox,

I am in the Bahamas on vacation. I did not know that I needed to sign the Joint Status Report before I left; nevertheless, I reviewed it and it looks ok to me. Please put an /s/ by my signature line as I have no way to sign it until next Monday.

Thank You,

Shawn M. Olson, Esq. OLSON LAW FIRM 7372 Prince Drive, Suite 104 Huntington Beach, CA 92647 Telephone: (714) 847-2500 Facsimile: (714) 847-2550

From: Tricia Lenox [mailto:tricia@abdallahlaw.net]

Sent: Monday, November 08, 2010 9:14 AM

To: 'Shawn@shawnolsonlaw.com'; 'fred@fredpardes.com'

Cc: 'Mitch Abdallah'

Subject: Washington v. Home Loans Direct

Attached is our proposed Joint Status Report, which is past due (should have been filed Nov. 1). Please review and return your signature page to me as soon as possible. I want to e-file this today. If there are edits you want made, let me know. (I also faxed this document to both of you this morning.)

Tricia Lenox, Paralegal

1006 4th Street, 4th Floor

Sacramento, CA 95814

916-446-1974 [fax 916-446-3371]

1	Washington v. Home Loans Direct, et al. USDC, Central District of California, Case No. 2:09-CV-08213-SJO-RZ	
2 3	PROOF OF SERVICE	
4	I, the undersigned, declare: I am a citizen of the United States and am employed in the County	
5	of Sacramento, State of California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is 1006 4 th Street, 4 th Floor, Sacramento, California 95814.	
6	On November 9, 2010, I served the foregoing document described as: JOINT STATUS	
7	REPORT FOR SCHEDULING CONFERENCE on the interested parties in this action by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope addressed as follows:	
8	For Defendants Lodes Capital and Nikki Hall:	
9	Fred S. Pardes, Esq. Fred S. Pardes Law Offices	fred@fredpardes.com
10	34211 Pacific Coast Highway, Suite 103	
11	Dana Point, California 92629	(949) 443-3400 [fax 949-443-3601]
12	For Defendant Jonathan Annett: Shawn M. Olson, Esq.	
13	Olson Law Firm	Shawn@shawnolsonlaw.com
14	16351 Gothard Street, Suite D Huntington Beach, California 92647	(714) 847-2500 [fax 714-847-2550]
15	For Defendants Ocwen and MERS:	
16	Brent A. Kramer, Esq.	
17	Houser & Allison 3760 Kilroy Airport Way, Suite 260	bkramer@houser-law.com
18	Long Beach, California 90806	(949) 679-1111 [fax 949-679-1112]
19	() BY FACSIMILE to the fax numbers above.	
20	(X) BY ELECTRONIC MAIL to the email addresses above.	
21	() BY MAIL depositing the sealed envelope with the United States Postal Service with	
22	the postage fully prepaid. I am readily familiar with my employer's business practice for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service.	
23	Correspondence so collected and processed is deposited with the United States Postal Service the same day it is placed for collection in the ordinary course of business.	
24		
25	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct. Executed on November 9, 2010, in Sacramento, California.	
26		
27	Charles Jeney	
28	TRICIA LEN	IUA

JOINT STATUS REPORT FOR SCHEDULING CONFERENCE